

**To:** otto@demaximis.com[]  
**Cc:** rlaw@demaximis.com;CN=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[];  
N=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Bcc:** []  
**From:** CN=Stephanie Vaughn/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Tue 7/10/2012 5:47:21 PM  
**Subject:** Re: CWCM Rounds 1 &2 - Frequency of Detection (FOD) Summary

Hi Bill,

Below is an email you sent us about a month ago. Could you please provide more information on how you calculated the FODs?

Thanks,  
Stephanie

From: "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>  
To: Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>  
Date: 06/07/2012 01:48 PM  
Subject: CWCM Rounds 1 &2 - Frequency of Detection (FOD) Summary

Stephanie:

Below is a quick summary of the CWCM FOD for Rounds 1 &2 - which we have compiled

- . Mercury
- 100% detects in all locations for both events
- . 2,3,7,8-TCDD
- Routine Event #1
- . 89% FOD LPRSA
- . 60% FOD NBSA
- Routine Event #2
- . 82% FOD LPRSA
- . 58% FOD NBSA
- . PCBs
- Routine Event #1
- . Of 209 congeners, 190 detected NBSA (90%); 202 detected LPRSA (97%)
- Routine Event #2

Of 209 congeners, 189 detected NBSA (90%); 199 detected LPRSA (95%)

The PCB FODs in the Bay are approximately the same as the TCDD detections in the LPRSA - I guess I don't understand how the LPR TCDD FODs are acceptable for the modeling and the Bay PCB FODs are not.....